

# THE CANDID EXAMINER.

"EXAMINE YOURSELVES, WHETHER YE BE IN THE FAITH; PROVE YOUR OWN SELVES."—Paul.

VOL. 2.] MONTROSE, PA. FEB. 5, 1827, NO. 17

Examination of R. v. E. W. GOODMAN'S  
Sermon preached at Mount Pleasant.

(Continued from page 124.)

We now arrive at Mr. G's third position which reads thus—

"But, in the *Third place*; Reason teaches us that the everlasting punishment of the finally impenitent, is not inconsistent with the mercy of God."

Before he proceeds to his argument, he states what he has done—that he has proved, that *endless punishment* "is justly demanded by the holiness of God," and also, "that the goodness of God demands it." He adds, "that by the same principle of right by which they are punished at all, they are punished eternally." We should have thought that this last statement had been inadvertently dropped without due consideration, had not the same idea been communicated in other places with great apparent confidence of its propriety. In an other place he represents this same idea as follows,

"That they will be eternally punished, rests upon the same principles of consistency with the goodness of God, as does the fact that they will be punished at all, either in this life or the life to come."

We should consider ourselves the most wicked and cruel advisers, to recommend Mr. G. to conduct towards his children on the same principle, as he supports that God conducts towards his creatures. For then, "upon the same principle of right by

which" he punishes his children *at all*, he must punish them *to death*. God punished David for his great sin in causing the death of Uriah. Now upon the same principle that God punished David *at all* he must punish him *eternally*. An Apostle said, that the Lord "scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." Will Mr. G. abide by his statement, and contend, that *upon the same principle* that these sons are scourged or punished *at all*, they are punished *eternally*. There is not a man that liveth and sinneth not; therefore according to the principle of right, they are all punished. Reader you see the consequences of Mr. G's statement. God punishes the whole universal family of man. Now "upon the same principle of right by which" all men are punished *at all*, all men are punished *eternally*. This is the consequence of Mr. G's statement.

If the reader has dwelt sufficiently on this inconsistency of Mr. G's, we will present him with another in his principal argument.

"The nature of God is uncompounded, and hence he is One, and always the same. This unity of God, may be described as composed of various attributes, by the exercise of which we are able to conceive something of the nature of the various acts that he performs among men. This view of God, is in perfect harmony with our doctrine of three persons in one God. If then two separate acts proceed from the same being, and that being be perfect in all his

attributes, these acts cannot be inconsistent, the one with the other, although they proceed from the exercise of different attributes ; because the attributes are in essence *the same*.

As there is therefore no contradiction in the attributes of God, there is no foundation for supposing any inconsistency between the acts that spring from them. God may then, if he please, by the exercise of his justice, punish one sinner *eternally*, while his mercy affords the other an *everlasting* salvation, and there cannot be a contradiction in these acts, because the source whence they proceed is *one* and perfectly pure."

Mr. G. we conceive, is correct, when he says, that the *acts* of God "cannot be inconsistent, the one with the other, altho' they proceed from the exercise of different attributes : because the attributes are in essence *the same*." Now reader look carefully at the *acts* which Mr. G. says may proceed from the exercise of these attributes which "are in essence *the same*. God may —by the exercise of his justice, punish one sinner *eternally*, while his mercy affords the other an *everlasting* salvation." Is it possible that the attributes from which proceed these two perfectly opposite *acts* "are in essence *the same*?" These two acts are as widely different as can be imagined. *Justice* punishes one sinner *eternally*—*Mercy* affords the other *everlasting* salvation. If these attributes are in essence the same, why do they produce acts so diametrically opposite to each other. Should a parent doom one of his children to the most extreme torture, so long as it lived, and afford another of the same character the most perfect happiness and enjoyment could we with any kind of reason, say, that these two *acts* proceed from the exercise of principles in the parent, which are in es-

*sence the same* ? God is good, and a *good tree bringeth not forth evil fruit* neither doth a *fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter*. But Mr. G's statement presents us in God, a *tree* which bears the fruit of *eternal death*, and also the fruit of *eternal life*—a *fountain* from which flows the bitter waters of *endless death*, and the sweet streams of *life and salvation*.—

The statement that the attributes of God are in essence *the same*, is correct. But the conclusion, that *one* of these attributes punishes "one sinner *eternally*," while another affords another sinner an "*everlasting* salvation," is a perfect contradiction of the former statement. If the attributes of God are in essence *the same*, it is clearly obvious, that the *acts* which proceed from their exercise, are also the same and alike; therefore, if any one of these attributes affords one sinner an everlasting salvation, this same attribute and all others which are the same in essence, will afford every sinner the same salvation. Mr. G. continues his argument as follows,—

"But, if the eternal punishment of the wicked be inconsistent with the mercy of God, then the mercy and justice of God are at variance, &c." "The first proposition with the advocate of universal salvation, should be, *the injustice of God in the eternal punishment of the helpless sinner*."

Although Mr. G. appears to inculcate with such perfect assurance, that the justice of God requires eternal punishment yet we feel as much assured that it requires exactly the contrary. None will dispute but that in order for a sinner to be endlessly miserable, he must necessarily remain, in an endless state of disobedience and sin,

as it would be impossible in the nature of things, for a perfectly obedient and holy being to be endlessly miserable: Therefore, if justice requires endless misery, it must also, as a necessary consequence, require endless disobedience and sin, in order to procure this misery. But the justice of God requires perfect obedience—supreme love to God and men which is the only element of true happiness.

The remaining arguments advanced under this head, are drawn from the supposition that sin is an *infinite evil*, and as we think we have fully refuted this notion in the former part of our examination, it is not necessary to have a recurrence of the same subject in this place. But we will give the following specimen of this part of the sermon.

“If sin be but a small offence, why was it necessary that Christ should be *God* in order to give efficacy to the blood of the cross. Indeed, in this case, there would be no necessity for any atonement at all.” &c. “But, perhaps our opponents will say, we agree with you. Without the shedding of his blood, there could have been no remission of sins. This plea is in vain, as has been already shewn. Either sin is an infinite evil, or no atonement is necessary; and if the doctrine of universal redemption be not false, then *Christ is dead in vain*.”

What Mr. G. means by all this, we are not able to determine. Indeed, we cannot comprehend his object. We presume his object was not to communicate absurdities in every idea advanced; and so of course, he happened to communicate something different from his object. He thinks if sin is not *infinite*, there would be no necessity of any atonement at all. Why not? On a certain occasion, Jesus represented *one sinner* by a person owing *fifty pence*, and an-

nother by a person owing *five hundred*—According to Christ's application of this subject, it is plain that it was necessary, that the least of these sinners should be forgiven, reconciled and receive the atonement, as well as the greatest. Who will dispute but that some men's sins are much smaller and of a less evil nature than the sins of some others; yet an atonement is made for the former, as well as for the latter: But according to Mr. G. this *atonement is unnecessary*. Why then was it made? Finally, Mr. G. winds up his string of strange assertions by saying, “if the doctrine of universal redemption be not false, then *Christ is dead in vain*.” Thus if Christ by his death and sufferings, shall finally redeem all from sin and misery he *is dead in vain*. We pray for those who thus set at nought the death of Christ because it is to eventuate in such a boundless and universal blessing, as Jesus prayed for his enemies, *Father forgive them, for they know not what they do*.

We now come to his “*Second General Head*,” which proposes to prove from scripture that “punishment will be everlasting; or in other words, without end.” He first dwells upon his text, and enters into a criticism on the original Greek word translated *everlasting, eternal* &c. In this criticism is explained what the public has long been in possession of—that the extent of the signification of these words, is limited or extended by the nature of the subject to which they apply. Mr. G. shows that everlasting, forever &c. in scripture frequently mean an endless; and also that they



mean a limited duration when applied to things of a limited, temporal existence.—

There would be no particular dispute in this part of his sermon, only concerning his application of some passages of scripture. But as he uses no argument to prove the correctness of his application of these passages, we shall only give one instance, that our readers may have a specimen of his mode of applying these scriptures. Speaking of the words "forever and ever," he says,—

"In the New Testament, they are *always* applied to eternity, and *never* to time, and like the words 'everlasting, and forever,' when applied to eternity, they mean an eternal duration. Let this be distinctly recollected when you read in your Testament—thus "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night." "And again they said, Alleluia. And her smoke rose up forever and ever."—And the Devil that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever."

If Mr. G. had not committed so many palpable mistakes, we should attribute the above to carelessness, and not to a want of penetration. It is really mortifying that a man of his opportunities and science, should not perceive that *forever and ever* in the passages he has cited in the above extract, are applied particularly to *time*, and also to *time* measured by *day and night*. When it can be shown that *day and night* are not *time*, then it can also be shown that *forever and ever*, in the above cited scriptures, which are put in apposition with *day and night*, are applied to *eternity* and not to *time*: But never before.

(To be continued.)

#### AN EXTRACT.

Could we draw back the covering of the tomb—could we see what those are now, who were once mortal—Oh! how would it surprise and grieve us to behold the prodigious transformation that has taken place on every individual—grieve us to see the dishonor done to our nature in general, within these subterraneous lodgments—here the sweet and winning aspect, that were perpetually an attracting smile, grins horribly—a naked ghastly grin!—The eye that outshone the diamond's lustre, and glanced its lovely lightning into the most guarded heart—alas! where is it? How are all those radiant glories totally eclipsed? That tongue that once commanded all the charms of harmony, and all the powers of eloquence, in this strange land hath forgot its cunning. Where are the strains of melody which ravished our ear? Where the flow of persuasion which carried captive our judgments? The great master of language and of song is become silent as the night which surrounds him.

#### JOHN KNOX.

The pure, heart-searching doctrines, which were preached by the Scotch apostle were then, as they are now, offensive to the carnal heart; and hence he was commanded by the voluptuous court of Mary, to desist. Knox, who knew no master, and obeyed no mandate that was in opposition to his God and his Bible, paid no attention to this command of the palace. Hearing immediately from the enemies of the cross, who were then, as I fear they are at present, the favorites and friends of the palace, that her orders were disobeyed; the haughty Mary summoned the Scottish reformer into her presence. When Knox arrived he was ushered into the room in which were the queen and her attendant lords. On being questioned concerning his contumacy, he answered plainly that he preached nothing but truth, and that he dare not preach less. "But, (answered one of the lords) our commands must be obeyed, on pain of death—silence or the gallows is the alternative." The spirit of Knox was roused by the dastardly insinuation that any human punishment could make him desert the banner of his Saviour;

and with that fearless, indescribable courage, which disdains the pomp of language or of action, he firmly replied—"My lords, you are mistaken if you think you can intimidate me to do by threats, what conscience and God tell me I never shall do: for be it known unto you, that it is a matter of no importance to me, when I have finished my work, whether my bones shall bleach in the winds of heaven, or rot in the bosom of the earth." Knox having retired, one of the lords said to the Queen, "We may let him alone, for we cannot punish that man." Well, therefore, might it be said by a nobleman at the grave of John Knox, "Here lies one who never feared the face of man."

---

### CANDID EXAMINER.

---

"WHAT IS TRUTH."

---

MONTROSE, FEBRUARY, 5.

---

#### COMPARISONS OF SCRIPTURE.

"Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord"—Heb. 12:14

"Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him"—Rev. 1:7.

"If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature"—2. Cor. 5:17.

"And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold I make all things new"—Rev. 21:5.

"No man can say that Jesus Christ is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost" 1 Cor. 12:3.

"And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father"—Phil. 2:11.

The Argument. Negation. Without holiness no man shall see the Lord. But every eye shall see him: Therefore: No man can then, be unholy.

Affirmation. Every eye shall see the Lord.—But without holiness, no man shall see him. Therefore:

Every man shall be rendered holy.

He that is in Christ is a new creature.—

All things shall be made new. Therefore:

All things shall be gathered together in Christ.

All the kindreds of the earth shall be blessed in Christ.

As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

He that is in Christ is a new creature, and all things shall be made new.

Negation. No man can say that Jesus Christ is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost. But every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord. Therefore:

Every one shall be taught by the Holy Ghost.

Affirmation. Every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord. But none can say that he is Lord but by the Holy Ghost. Therefore:

Every one shall be instructed and renewed by the Holy Ghost. Every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear—surely shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength.

Conclusion. No wise and good being will finally curse his own work. God is a wise and good being. Therefore:

God will not finally curse his own work.

---

#### AN IMPORTANT QUESTION.

"What is truth?" Answer. "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life." John, 14, 6. "And the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (& we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth. For the Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. John, 1. 11, 17.

Again. "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth." 1. John



5, 6. "Howbeit, when he, the spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth, for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak and he will show you things to come." Sohn 16. 13.—What has this *spirit of truth* which was sent to guide into all truth, testified concerning man? answer. "There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable: there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Because this was the condition of mankind, the spirit of truth was sent to enlighten their understanding, and direct them to seek after God; and Jesus the *way*, the *truth* and the *light*, was sent to enlighten them into the *true way*. They will prosper in the labor assigned them. Jesus said "no man cometh to the Father but by me." He also said "all that the Father giveth to me shall come to me; also, "and I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." All men therefore shall come to the Father through Christ.—The effect of this *truth* into which the spirit shall guide, and into which Jesus shall draw all men, is thus described, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." "If the son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." The spirit of *truth* which was sent to guide us into all truth, and to show us things to come, has testified that the whole creation shall eventually be made *free* in the most perfect sense of the word. *The whole creation which groaneth and travaileth in pain*, "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God." "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. Death the last enemy shall be destroyed."

This is a truth which produces joy in heaven, and those who *believe* on earth, "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

#### DEVILS.

The limitarians who thrive under the doctrine which teaches that there are invisible yet identical devils that tempt men

to sin in this world, and are instruments to torment them in another, appear extremely vexed at those who disbelieve and deny the identity of these devils which hold such a conspicuous station in their religious faith. The most severe accusations have been levelled at the universalists for not giving full credence to all the airy speculations concerning devils. A multitude of instances remain in our memories where great vexation and sharp reproofs have been produced for a denial of the identity of these beings. These same murmurings have also frequently appeared in print; and it is by no means strange, that a denial of these mysterious and spiritual demagogues, should create such uneasiness, when they constitute a very important part of that machinery, by which the orthodox originate and mature many of their grand schemes, by exciting the fear of the people. You take away these beings and you leave an irreparable deficiency in their whole system. The complaint against universalists for renouncing these devils, we have tho't might be illustrated by a circumstance recorded in the 18th chap. of Judges. Micah following after the children of Dan who had taken away his idols from his house of gods, being inquired of, "What aileth thee," replied, "Ye have taken away my gods which I made, and the priest, and ye have gone away; and what have I more." By reversing this text a little, you will see how near it compares with the complaint in question, "You have taken away my devils which I made, by which the priests terrified the people, and what have I more." Among the catholics, when it is thought necessary to excite the terror and operate on the fear and passions of the vulgar, these devils are exercised to great advantage and with wonderful success. Many of the protestants also are not deficient in these practices. But these things are growing less and less efficient. The stories of witches which have shook the nerves of thousands with terror, have now become fables. And as the sun of reason rises upon the people, these devils recede like ghosts which only walk in the night. The apostles never enforced a belief in devils. They exhorted to "believe the gospel,"—"believe on the Lord Jesus." The eu-

Such was qualified to be baptized when he could say, "I believe Jesus Christ is the son of God."

FROM DICK'S PHILOSOPHER.  
VOLCANOES.

The ravages produced by volcanoes are in proportion to the terror they inspire. In the eruption of *Ætna*, in 1669, the stream of lava destroyed, in 40 days, the habitations of *twenty-seven thousand* persons; and of *twenty thousand* inhabitants of the city of *Catania*, only *three thousand* escaped. In the year 79, the celebrated cities of *Pompeii* and *Herculaneum* were completely overwhelmed and buried under ground, by an eruption of *Vesuvius*, and the spots on which they stood remained unknown for *sixteen hundred* years. Since that period, about 40 eruptions have taken place, each of them producing the most dreadful ravages. But the volcanoes of Asia and America are still more terrible and destructive than those of Europe.

The volcanic mountain *Pichincha*, near *Quito*, caused, on one occasion, the destruction of *thirty-five thousand* inhabitants. In the year 1772 an eruption of a mountain in the island of *Java*, destroyed 40 villages: and several thousands of the inhabitants; and in October, 1822, eighty-eight hamlets and above *two thousand* persons were destroyed in the same island by a sudden eruption from a new volcano. The eruption of *Tomboro* in the island of *Sumhawa*, in 1815, was so dreadful, that all the *Moluccas*, *Java*, *Sumatra*, and *Borneo*, to the distance of a thousand miles from the mountain, felt tremulous emotions, and heard the report of explosion. In *Java*, at the distance of 240 miles, the clouds of ashes from the volcano produced utter darkness.

ANECDOTES.—A countryman meeting the prime bishop of *Strasburg* at the head of an army, asked him how a successor to the peaceable apostles could so far violate his sacred office as to lead men to war. "I do not lead them as an *archbishop*, but as a *prince of Strasburg*," was the reply. "I should like to know," said the countryman, "if the prince of *Strasburg* should chance to go to the devil, what would become of the Archbishop."

Not many years since, a clergyman in the kingdom of *Prussia*, by searching the scriptures, was led to give up the cruel doctrine of endless misery, being convinced that the salvation of all men was clearly revealed in the writings of the Apostles and Prophets. As an honest man, he was constrained to preach against what he had before considered true. This greatly alarmed the parish, particularly the leading men, who exhorted and warned him to desist from such a dangerous mode of preaching. But this only served to increase his zeal in what he considered a good cause. At length the parish officers told him they would present a complaint against him to his majesty, unless he would preach endless misery. All this only made him more bold in preaching salvation to all. The king soon received a letter of complaint, and wrote to the clergyman directing him to read the king's letter to his congregation at the close of the afternoon service. This he informed the people of, and when they were all seated he read the following from the king:

"Seeing my *Prussian* subjects in the parish of — are so fond of eternal misery, this is to certify the n, that they have my full consent to be damned to all eternity if they choose it.

Signed, *King of Prussia.*"

This letter so mortified the opposers of the clergyman, that they renounced their old cruel doctrine, and believed that God our creator regards the works of his hands.

Moral.—It is worthy of notice, that the earnest defenders of the doctrine of endless misery, never expect to be the subjects of that misery themselves. It is always their wicked neighbor, the blinded infidel, or the benighted heathen. Also, those whom they sincerely love, their children, their kindred cannot be given up, by their feeling hearts to the dreadfulness of its doom. If such die not giving clear evidence of being born again in this world, they catch upon some faint evidence, lay hold on some hope that they are prepared, or else they say "they are in the hands of a merciful God."

Did they believe themselves the victims of this misery, it would produce despair or that their children and friends were the victims, it would produce distraction. But it may be well with those they devotedly



love, but *sinner*s must go to *hell*. Now did such think themselves no better than their neighbor, or according to the commandment of Paul, "esteem others better than themselves," and so look on themselves as liable to the severe malediction of God, and as promising candidates to an endless hell as any, we think they might be impelled to look about them, and by a more thorough investigation of the mercy of God laid up in store for desponding sinners, obtain some more favorable ideas of the kind God of heaven.

Argue to these men that all the misery in which they believe will be their own portion, they shudder and appear displeased; argue that it is the portion of others who are wicked, and they exult in the argument. It is easy to see these men are cooking this doctrine alone for their neighbors and I once heard a person say, "it was an established rule with him not to board with people who would not eat their own cooking."

## Poetry.

### THE ORPHAN BOY.

Alas! I am an Orphan Boy.  
With nought on earth to cheer my heart:  
No father's love, no mother's joy,  
No kin nor kind to take my part.  
My lodging is the cold, cold ground,  
I eat the bread of charity;  
And when the kiss of love goes round,  
There is no kiss, alas, for me.

Yet, once I had a father dear,  
A mother too I wont to prize,  
With ready hand to wipe the tear,  
If chance'd the transient tear to rise.  
But cause of tears was rarely found,  
For all my heart was youthful glee;  
And when the kiss of love went round,  
How sweet a kiss there was for me.

But ah! there came a war they say,  
What is a war? I cannot tell;—  
The drums and fife's did sweetly play,  
And loudly rang our village bell.  
In truth, it was a pretty sound  
I thought—nor could I thence foresee,  
That when the kiss of love went round  
There soon would be no kiss for me.

A scarlet coat my father took,

And sword as bright as bright could be  
And feathers that so gaily look,  
All in a shining cap had he.  
Then how my little heart did bound,  
Alas, I thought it fine to see,  
Nor dreamt, that when the kiss went round  
There soon would be no kiss for me.

At length the bell again did ring,—  
There was a victory, they said;  
'Twas what my father said he'd bring;  
But, ah! it brought my father dead.  
My mother shriek'd her heart was wo,  
She clasp'd me to her trembling knee:—  
O God! that you may never know  
How wild a kiss she gave to me!

But once again—but once again,  
These lips a mother's kisses felt,  
That once again—that once again,  
The tale a heart of stone would melt.  
'Twas when upon her death bed laid,  
O God! O God! that sight to see,  
"My child, my child," she feebly said,  
And gave a parting kiss to me.

So now I am an orphan boy,  
With nought below my heart to cheer;  
No mother's love no father's joy,  
Nor kin nor kind to wipe the tear;  
My lodging is the cold, cold ground,  
I eat the bread of charity;  
And when the kiss of love goes round,  
There is, alas, no kiss for me.

### Dialogue between a Universalist and Calvinist.

U. Will you have the goodness to state to me your opinion concerning the future state of infants?

C. My opinion is, that all infants are included in the covenant of redemption; and therefore, that all infants will be saved.

U. Well, Sir, all mankind are, or have been infants; and consequently, are all included in the covenant of redemption. Will not all mankind be saved, on your own principles?

C. (Stammering) I—I—I—have given you my—views.—*Religious Inquirer.*

*Printed every other Monday, by DIMOCK & FULLER, at \$1 per annum, for C. R. MARSH, Editor, to whom letters and communications postage paid, may be directed.*